

**REMARKS**

By this Amendment, claim 3 is amended to delete the phrase “*said resin fine particles are one of a solid and a powder.*” Support for this claim amendment can be found variously throughout the specification. Claims 3-8 are pending in this application.

Reexamination and reconsideration in light of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

**Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112**

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

However, in order to expedite prosecution, claim 3 is amended to delete the phrase “*said resin fine particles are one of a solid and a powder*” thereby mooting this rejection.

Thus, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

**Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,706,801 to Blum et al. Applicants wish to provide further comments with respect to this rejection.

Claim 3 was amended in Applicant’s response dated November 18, 2004 to recite that the ratio of isocyanate group in the (D) component to 1 equivalent of hydroxyl group in the (A) component is greater than 2.0 equivalents and less than or equal to 4.0 equivalents.

In Examples (as shown in the present specification) where the HCO/OH equivalent ratio is below 2.0, the gloss of the coating film is deteriorated. This is due to the fact that when top coating is carried out, it tends to be solved with solvent of coating material for top coating. An example of such deterioration can be found in the Comparative Example disclosed in the specification in which 0.7 NCO/OH equivalents ratio is used. Such a feature is not at all disclosed, taught or suggested by Blum et al. ‘801.

Thus, for this and other reasons previously discussed, withdrawal of this §103 rejection is respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons, claims 3-8 are allowable, and the present application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reexamination and reconsideration of the application in light of these amendments and remarks is courteously solicited. If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions that would place this application in even better form, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number below.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 18-0013, under Order No. KPC-294 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: February 28, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Lee Cheng

Registration No.: 40,949  
RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC  
1233 20th Street, N.W.  
Suite 501  
Washington, DC 20036  
(202) 955-3750  
Attorney for Applicant